



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/670,549

09/25/2003

Rahul L. Shah

5681-69800

5477

58467

7590

06/26/2009

MHKKG/SUN

P.O. BOX 398

AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER

WASEL, MOHAMED A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2454

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/26/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent_docketing@intprop.com

ptomhkg@gmail.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/670,549	Applicant(s) SHAH, RAHUL L.	
	Examiner MOHAMED WASEL	Art Unit 2454	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This action is responsive to amendment filed on September 12, 2008. Claims 1, 3-11 and 13-30 are pending and presented for examination.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29, and 30 of 10/670549 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 11, 20, 30, 47, and 56 of copending Application No. 10/670849 in view of McDowell et al (US publication number 2002/0035605, dated March 21, 2002). This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Regarding claim 9 of 10/670549 vs. claim 1 of 10/670849:

Claim 1 of '0849 discloses the method steps comprising: receiving an instant messaging operation directed to a given user, wherein said given user is not offline; determining a presence state of said instant messenger in response to receiving said instant messaging operation; and selectively processing said instant messaging operation dependent upon said presence state in response to said determining. Claim 1 of 10/670849 teaches all the limitations of claim 9 of 10/670549 except that claim 9 of 10/670549 includes the method steps of storing and querying schedule information and assigning presence states when they are different.

The general concept of providing schedule information, storing it, and querying it, and assigning presence states is well known in the art as illustrated by McDowell (US publication 2002/0035605, dated

Art Unit: 2454

March 21, 2002), hereinafter referred to as McDowell, who discloses providing schedule information in a presence detection method. McDowell teaches the method steps of storing and querying schedule information and assigning presence states if they are different. In paragraph P13, paragraph 0135, line 8, McDowell states, that imported items into the Privacy database include "PIM contents, (i.e. calendar...)", thereby providing a place to store and use schedule information. McDowell also discloses that his system does "presence determination" as disclosed in his abstract, line 1, and discloses that message blocking is also possible for presence detection with "calendar programs", on P13, paragraph 0129, line 12.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify claim 1 of 10/670849 to include the limitations of storing and querying schedule information and assigning presence states in his advantageous presence detection and scheduling method as taught by McDowell in order to integrate the invention "into a functionally seamless system" as stated by McDowell in his Abstract, lines 2-3.

Claims 9, 10, 19, and 20 of 10/670549 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9, 18, 28, and 37, respectively of copending Application No. 10/670849. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Regarding claim 9 of 10/670549 vs. claim 9 of 10/670849, claim 10 of 10/670549 vs. claim 18 of 10/670849, claim 19 of 10/670549 vs. claim 28 of 10/670849, and claim 20 of 10/670549 vs. claim 37 of 10/670849, similar arguments apply to these claims as the previous obvious type double patenting rejections.

Claims 8 and 18 of 10/670549 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12 and 26, respectively of copending Application No. 10/670550. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Regarding claims 8 and 8 of 10/670549, similar arguments apply to these obvious type double patenting as the previous obviousness type double patenting rejections.

Applicant's response to provisional double patenting rejection has been noted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 15-17, and 19-22, 25-27, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDowell et al, (McDowell) US Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0035605 in view of Knauerhase et al, (Knauerhase) US Application Pub. No. 2003/0104819 and in further view of Doss et al, (Doss) US Patent Application Pub. No. 2008/0065461.

Regarding claims 1 and 11:

McDowell discloses a computer-implemented method, comprising: storing schedule information corresponding to a given user, wherein said schedule information is indicative of an activity status of said given user at a given time; querying said schedule information; and if a current presence state of an instant messenger does not correspond to said activity status indicated by said schedule information, assigning a different presence state that corresponds to said activity status in response to said querying, wherein said current presence state and said different presence state each correspond to said given user. (McDowell discloses the use of schedule information in Table 5, p 12 where he discloses "Please indicate which time of day you do not wish to receive messages. Please indicate which days of the week you do". McDowell also discloses that the "Campaign Manager queries the Presence Server to know if a particular subscriber's phone is on or OFF before attempting to send a targeted mobile commercial message" on P3 of the specification, paragraph 56, lines 7-10. McDowell also discloses that the user can change their current presence state to a different presence state in addition to the schedule information in Tables 1 and 2, page 5 of the specification.)

McDowell fails to explicitly teach a calendar application which is queried for activity status at one or more given times, and determining, for said particular time, whether a current presence state, which is

Art Unit: 2454

associated with said given user and is specific to an instant messenger client corresponds to said activity status indicated by said schedule information corresponding to said given user; and in response to determining specific to the client automatically assigning and storing a different presence state.

However, Knauerhase discloses a calendar application (paragraph 0038) which is queried for activity status at one or more given times, (The schedule is checked for activity status by determining the current time for the corresponding schedule repeatedly for one or more given times. Paragraphs 0062 and 0063) and determining for each given time whether a current presence state specific to an instant messenger client corresponds to said activity status indicated by said schedule information; (paragraph 0062, and the subsequent paragraphs through 0071 also disclose current times and presence state for each given time) and in response to determining specific to the client automatically assigning (title, "Automatically updating..." and storing a different presence state. (Abstract, "...state is saved")

In addition, McDowell fails to explicitly teach wherein for at least a particular one of said one or more given times, said activity status includes a corresponding event title that is specifically descriptive of said given user's activity at said particular time and wherein said different presence state corresponding to said activity status of said particular time is indicative of at least a portion of said corresponding event title included in said activity status.

However, Doss discloses wherein for at least a particular one of said one or more given times, said activity status includes a corresponding event title that is specifically descriptive of said given user's activity at said particular time and wherein said different presence state corresponding to said activity status of said particular time is indicative of at least a portion of said corresponding event title included in said activity status (paragraph(s) [0006], [0032], [0059]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants' invention to combine the teachings of McDowell, Knauerhase and Doss because it provides a calendar application capable to updating other users of the current status of a given user to improve communication efficiency among co-workers or group users.

Art Unit: 2454

Regarding claim 5:

McDowell discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to an engaged state in response to detecting a engaged activity status of said given user.

(McDowell discloses in Table 1, P5 of the specification, that his method and system can detect an “engaged” state when the subscriber is in a voice call, and also discloses other presence states in Table 1, and discloses “presence determination” in his Abstract, line 1.)

Regarding claim 6:

McDowell discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to an online state in response to detecting an available activity status of said given user. (Table 1, P5 of the specification also discloses an “Online-Available” state, and also discloses “presence determination” in his Abstract, line 1.)

Regarding claim 7:

McDowell discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to a state determined by said schedule information. (On P12, Table 5, McDowell discloses that a user can enter which days of the week and which times the user does not wish to receive messages. It is implied that the presence state would be transitioned to unavailable during those times.)

Regarding claim 9:

McDowell discloses the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: receiving an instant messaging operation directed to said given user, wherein said given user is not offline; determining the presence state specific to said instant messenger client in response to receiving said instant messaging operation; and selectively processing said instant messaging operation dependent upon said presence state in response to said determining. (McDowell discloses “the integration of presence determination,

Art Unit: 2454

location determination, instant messaging...into a functionally seamless system". P2 of specification, paragraph 0014, lines 2-4. McDowell also discloses several presence states which are not offline in Table 1, P 5 of the specification. "The SMSC 134 can query the Presence Server 112 before attempting to send a message, eliminating inefficient retry attempts", thereby selectively processing the instant messaging operation. P4, paragraph 0053, column 2, last three lines.)

Regarding claim 10:

McDowell discloses the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: storing an instant messaging operation associated with a given presence state of said instant messenger, wherein said given presence state corresponds to a given user; detecting a transition to said given presence state subsequent to said storing; and performing said instant messaging operation in response to said detecting. (McDowell discloses that the Short Message Service Center can "query the Presence Server 112 before attempting to send a message, eliminating inefficient retry attempts" on P 4, paragraph 0053, last three lines, column 2. It is inherent that the message must have been stored in order to send it later.)

Regarding claim 15:

McDowell discloses the computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 11, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to an engaged state in response to detecting an engaged activity status of said given user. (McDowell discloses in Table 1, P5 of the specification, that his method and system can detect an "engaged" state when the subscriber is in a voice call, and also discloses other presence states in Table 1, and discloses "presence determination" in his Abstract, line 1.)

Regarding claim 16:

McDowell discloses the computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 11, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to an online state in response

Art Unit: 2454

to detecting an available activity status of said given user. (Table 1, P5 of the specification also discloses an "Online-Available" state, and also discloses "presence determination" in his Abstract, line 1.)

Regarding claim 17:

McDowell discloses the computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 11, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to a state determined by said schedule information. (On P12, Table 5, McDowell discloses that a user can enter which days of the week and which times the user does not wish to receive messages. It is implied that the presence state would be transitioned to unavailable during those times.)

Regarding claim 19:

McDowell discloses the computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 11, wherein said program instructions are further computer-executable to: receive an instant messaging operation directed to said given user, wherein said given user is not offline; determine the presence state specific to said instant messenger client in response to receiving said instant messaging operation; and selectively process said instant messaging operation dependent upon said presence state in response to said determining. (McDowell discloses a Presence Server, IM Server, and Campaign Manager in his PLIM system for performing these functions. McDowell discloses "the integration of presence determination, location determination, instant messaging...into a functionally seamless system". P2 of specification, paragraph 0014, lines 2-4. McDowell also discloses several presence states which are not offline in Table 1, P 5 of the specification. "The SMSC 134 can query the Presence Server 112 before attempting to send a message, eliminating inefficient retry attempts", thereby selectively processing the instant messaging operation. P4, paragraph 0053, column 2, last three lines.)

Regarding claim 20:

McDowell discloses the computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 11, wherein said program instructions are further computer-executable to: store an instant messaging operation associated

Art Unit: 2454

with a given presence state of said instant messenger client, wherein said given presence state corresponds to the given user; detect a transition to said given presence state subsequent to said storing; and perform said instant messaging operation in response to said detecting. (McDowell discloses that the Short Message Service Center can “query the Presence Server 112 before attempting to send a message, eliminating inefficient retry attempts” on P 4, paragraph 0053, last three lines, column 2. It is inherent that the message must have been stored in order to send it later.)

Regarding claim 21:

Claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale and reasoning as claim 1.

Regarding claim 22:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein said calendar application software module and said instant messenger software module are integrated into a common software module. (McDowell discloses that his “Presence determination, location determination, instant messaging...” are “integrated into a functionally seamless system.” This implies a common software module if they are integrated.

Regarding claim 25:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to an engaged state in response to detecting an engaged activity status of said given user.

(McDowell discloses in Table 1, P5 of the specification, that his method and system can detect an “engaged” state when the subscriber is in a voice call, and also discloses other presence states in Table 1, and discloses “presence determination” in his Abstract, line 1.)

Regarding claim 26:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to an online state in response to detecting an available activity status of said given user. (Table 1, P5 of the specification also discloses an "Online-Available" state, and also discloses "presence determination" in his Abstract, line 1.)

Regarding claim 27:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to a state determined by said schedule information. (On P12, Table 5, McDowell discloses that a user can enter which days of the week and which times the user does not wish to receive messages. It is implied that the presence state would be transitioned to unavailable during those times.)

Regarding claim 29:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein said instant messenger software module is further configured to: receive an instant messaging operation directed to said given user, wherein said given user is not offline; determine a presence state specific to said instant messenger software module in response to receiving said instant messaging operation; and selectively process said instant messaging operation dependent upon said presence state in response to said determining. (McDowell discloses "the integration of presence determination, location determination, instant messaging...into a functionally seamless system" implying instant messages are received. P2 of specification, paragraph 0014, lines 2-4. McDowell also discloses several presence states which are not offline for a given user in Table 1, P 5 of the specification. "The SMSC 134 can query the Presence Server 112 before attempting to send a message, eliminating inefficient retry attempts", thereby selectively processing the instant messaging operation. P4, paragraph 0053, column 2, last three lines.)

Art Unit: 2454

Regarding claim 30:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein said instant messenger software module is further configured to: store an instant messaging operation associated with a given presence state of said instant messenger software module, wherein said given presence state corresponds to said given user; detect a transition to said given presence state subsequent to said storing; and perform said instant messaging operation in response to said detecting. (McDowell discloses that the Short Message Service Center can “query the Presence Server 112 before attempting to send a message, eliminating inefficient retry attempts” on P 4, paragraph 0053, last three lines, column 2. It is inherent that the message must have been stored in order to send it later.)

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 11, 18, 21, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz (PCT application WO 01/69387, dated September 20, 2001) in view of Knauerhase.

Regarding claims 1 and 11:

Horvitz discloses a computer-implemented method, and computer accessible storage medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to do the following (P13, lines 15-22) and the method comprising: storing schedule information corresponding to a given user, wherein said schedule information is indicative of an activity status of said given user at a given time; querying said schedule information; and if a current presence state of an instant messenger does not correspond to said activity status indicated by said schedule information, assigning a different presence state that corresponds to said activity status in response to said querying, wherein said current presence state and said different presence state each correspond to said given user. (Horvitz’s analyzer uses “data in the user’s calendar” and makes observations about the user’s activity, to determine states such as “busy” or “open to receiving notification”, P8, lines 16-21. Horvitz uses “active polling” or querying ...”by the receipt of information”, disclosing that schedules are queried. lines 2-3, P15. Horvitz also explicitly states that his system performs “scheduling queries”, on line 27, P 9 of the specification)

Horvitz discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for a calendar application which is queried for activity status at one or more given times, and determining for each given time whether a current presence state specific to an instant messenger client corresponds to said activity status indicated by said schedule information; and in response to determining specific to the client automatically assigning and storing a different presence state.

Knauerhase discloses a calendar application (paragraph 0038) which is queried for activity status at one or more given times, (The schedule is checked for activity status by determining the current time for the corresponding schedule repeatedly for one or more given times. Paragraphs 0062 and 0063) and determining for each given time whether a current presence state specific to an instant messenger client corresponds to said activity status indicated by said schedule information; (paragraph 0062, and the subsequent paragraphs through 0071 also disclose current times and presence state for each given time) and in response to determining specific to the client automatically assigning (title, "Automatically updating..." and storing a different presence state. (abstract, "...state is saved")

Regarding claim 4:

Horvitz discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein querying said schedule information comprises accessing said calendar application via a uniform resource locator (URL). (Since Horvitz discloses that "Selection of Universal Resource Locator (URL) addresses provided in the display, for example, may cause access of the information referred to by these addresses, for instance.", lines 16-18, P55. Horvitz also discloses that "Such sources of information can include the user's context profile, the user's online calendar,...", lines 1-2, P3 of the specification, implying that since the calendar is online it is accessed by the URL.)

Regarding claim 5:

Horvitz discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to an engaged state in response to detecting a engaged activity status of said given user. (Horvitz discloses that a user's "given state of attention can

Art Unit: 2454

include whether the user is open to receiving notification, busy and not open to receiving notification, and can include other considerations such as weekdays, weekends, holidays, and/or other occasions/periods.”, lines 20-22, p8 of the specification. Horvitz also discloses that “direct measurement of context indicates that sensor(s) can be employed to detect whether the user is amenable to receiving alerts...” implying that the sensors can detect an engaged state or an idle state, P21, lines 4-6).

Regarding claim 7:

Horvitz discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein assigning a different presence state comprises transitioning said current presence state to a state determined by said schedule information. (Horvitz discloses that his “context analyzer stores user profile information” and that the “notification manager can access or infer the context of the user, e.g., the user’s current location...”, on P 2 of the specification, lines 22-23, and lines 29-30, respectively, which would imply that a calendar application is provided to be able to tell where and when the user is located. Also Figure 8, item 152 depicts a calendar in the drawings, and by “accessing” the calendar, Horvitz is providing a calendar application, as disclosed on P23 of the specification, lines 29-30. Horvitz also discloses that “the context analyzer determines the current context of the user, such as the user’s current location and attentional state”, P3 of the specification, line 29-30, thereby implying that a user’s state can transition from a current state to a state determined by the user’s schedule.)

Regarding claim 8:

Horvitz discloses the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: detecting a computer system activity level indicative of computer system activity; determining whether said activity level exceeds an activity threshold in response to said detecting; and transitioning the presence state specific to said instant messenger client to a busy state in response to determining that said activity level exceeds said activity threshold, wherein said presence state corresponds to said given user. (P 20, discusses “predetermined thresholds”, and “attentional focus”, in order to decide “whether the user is currently amenable to receiving notification alerts.” lines 15, and 1-2, respectively. P21, line 22-23 discusses that

Art Unit: 2454

the “user should not presently be disturbed”, implying a busy state, and that by “typing very quickly”, that the “user is focused on a computer-related activity, and should not be unduly disturbed.” P21, line 31, and P22, line 1, respectively)

Regarding claim 18:

Horvitz discloses the computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 11, wherein said program instructions are further computer-executable to: detect a computer system activity level indicative of computer system activity; determine whether said activity level exceeds an activity threshold in response to said detecting; and transition the presence state specific to said instant messenger client to a busy state in response to determining that said activity level exceeds said activity threshold, wherein said presence state corresponds to the given user. (P 20, discusses “predetermined thresholds”, and “attentional focus”, in order to decide “whether the user is currently amenable to receiving notification alerts.” lines 15, and 1-2, respectively. P21, line 22-23 discusses that the “user should not presently be disturbed”, implying a busy state, and that by “typing very quickly”, that the “user is focused on a computer-related activity, and should not be unduly disturbed.” P21, line 31, and P22, line 1, respectively)

Regarding claim 21:

Horvitz discloses a system, comprising: a computer system; computer-accessible storage program instruction for an instant messenger software module configured to execute on said computer system; and a computer-accessible storage comprising program instruction for a calendar application software module computer-executable to store schedule information corresponding to a given user, wherein said schedule information is indicative of an activity status of said given user at a given time, and further configured to respond to queries of said schedule information from said instant messenger software module; wherein said instant messenger software module is further configured to: query said schedule information; and if a current presence state of said instant messenger software module does not correspond to said activity status indicated by said schedule information, assign a different presence state that corresponds to said activity status in response to said querying, wherein said current presence state

Art Unit: 2454

and said different presence state each correspond to said given user. (The Abstract discloses a system, line 1, an instant messaging software module is implied since the system performs notifications through a notification manager, line 5, P12. P20 discusses “predetermined thresholds”, and “attentional focus”, in order to decide “whether the user is currently amenable to receiving notification alerts.” lines 15, and 1-2, respectively. P21, line 22-23 discusses that the “user should not presently be disturbed”, implying a busy state, and that by “typing very quickly”, implying an activity threshold, that the “user is focused on a computer-related activity, and should not be unduly disturbed.” P21, line 31, and P22, line 1, respectively. A calendar application software module is provided by Horvitz because he “accesses” it as disclosed on P23 of the specification, lines 29-30.)

Horvitz discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for a calendar application which is queried for activity status at one or more given times, and determining for each given time whether a current presence state specific to an instant messenger client corresponds to said activity status indicated by said schedule information; and in response to determining specific to the client automatically assigning and storing a different presence state.

Knauerhase discloses a calendar application (paragraph 0038) which is queried for activity status at one or more given times, (The schedule is checked for activity status by determining the current time for the corresponding schedule repeatedly for one or more given times. Paragraphs 0062 and 0063) and determining for each given time whether a current presence state specific to an instant messenger client corresponds to said activity status indicated by said schedule information; (paragraph 0062, and the subsequent paragraphs through 0071 also disclose current times and presence state for each given time) and in response to determining specific to the client automatically assigning (title, “Automatically updating...”) and storing a different presence state. (abstract, “..state is saved”)

Regarding claim 28:

Horvitz discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein said instant messenger software module is further configured to: detect a computer system activity level indicative of computer system activity; determine whether said activity level exceeds an activity threshold in response to said detecting;

Art Unit: 2454

and transition the presence state specific to said instant messenger software module to a busy state in response to determining that said activity level exceeds said activity threshold, wherein said presence state corresponds to a given user. (P 20, discusses “predetermined thresholds”, and “attentional focus”, in order to decide “whether the user is currently amenable to receiving notification alerts.” lines 15, and 1-2, respectively. P21, line 22-23 discusses that the “user should not presently be disturbed”, implying a busy state, and that by “typing very quickly”, that the “user is focused on a computer-related activity, and should not be unduly disturbed.” P21, line 31, and P22, line 1, respectively)

Claims 3, 13, and 23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDowell and Knauerhase in view of Heinonen et al, hereinafter referred to as Heinonen (US Patent 678530, dated April 27, 2004, and filed on December 28, 1999)

Regarding claim 3:

McDowell discloses the method as recited in claim 2, wherein said calendar application is compliant with the Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification standard (RFC 2445). McDowell discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for making sure his calendar application is compliant with the Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification standard (RFC 2445).

Heinonen teaches the use of providing a calendar application compliant with RFC 2445, or iCalendar and vCalendar, in column 2, lines 25-27. The general concept of providing an application that is compliant with RFC 2445 is well known in the art as illustrated by Heinonen which discloses both iCalendar and vCalendar in a calendar application.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDowell of his instant messaging system which stores schedule information in his advantageous method as taught by Heinonen in order to “store”, column 1 line 12 of the specification, “receive and send calendar items by way of a SMS message”, as stated in column 2, lines 24-25.)

Art Unit: 2454

Regarding claim 13:

McDowell discloses the computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 12, wherein said calendar application is compliant with the Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification standard (RFC 2445). McDowell discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for making sure his calendar application is compliant with the Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification standard (RFC 2445).

Heinonen teaches the use of providing a calendar application compliant with RFC 2445, or iCalendar and vCalendar, in column 2, lines 25-27. The general concept of providing an application that is compliant with RFC 2445 is well known in the art as illustrated by Heinonen which discloses both iCalendar and vCalendar in a calendar application.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDowell of his instant messaging system which stores schedule information in his advantageous method as taught by Heinonen in order to “store”, column 1 line 12 of the specification, “receive and send calendar items by way of a SMS message”, as stated in column 2, lines 24-25.)

Regarding claim 23:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein said calendar application software module is compliant with the Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification standard (RFC 2445). McDowell discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for making sure his calendar application is compliant with the Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification standard (RFC 2445).

Heinonen teaches the use of providing a calendar application compliant with RFC 2445, or iCalendar and vCalendar, in column 2, lines 25-27. The general concept of providing an application that is compliant with RFC 2445 is well known in the art as illustrated by Heinonen which discloses both iCalendar and vCalendar in a calendar application.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDowell of his instant messaging system which stores schedule information in his advantageous

Art Unit: 2454

method as taught by Heinonen in order to “store”, column 1 line 12 of the specification, “receive and send calendar items by way of a SMS message”, as stated in column 2, lines 24-25.)

Claims 4, 14, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDowell in view of Knauerhase and Coan et al, hereinafter referred to as Coan (US Patent number 7,120,424, dated October 10, 2006, with a filing date of March 12, 2001)

Regarding claim 4:

McDowell discloses the method as recited in claim 2, wherein querying said schedule information comprises accessing said calendar application via a uniform resource locator (URL). McDowell discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for accessing said calendar application via a uniform resource locator (URL).

Coan teaches the ability to access calendar information through a URL. The general concept of providing the ability to access a calendar application through a URL is well known in the art as illustrated by Coan which discloses a URL access in a calendar application.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDowell of his calendar application in his advantageous method as taught by Coan in order to provide for the ability for “searching the calendar, getting information from the calendar, or putting information in the calendar” as stated by Coan in column 6, liners 11-14.

Regarding claim 14:

McDowell discloses 14. The computer-accessible medium as recited in claim 12, wherein querying said schedule information comprises accessing said calendar application via a uniform resource locator (URL). McDowell discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for accessing said calendar application via a uniform resource locator (URL).

Art Unit: 2454

Coan teaches the ability to access calendar information through a URL. The general concept of providing the ability to access a calendar application through a URL is well known in the art as illustrated by Coan which discloses a URL access in a calendar application.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDowell of his calendar application in his advantageous method as taught by Coan in order to provide for the ability for “searching the calendar, getting information from the calendar, or putting information in the calendar” as stated by Coan in column 6, liners 11-14.

Regarding claim 24:

McDowell discloses the system as recited in claim 21, wherein said instant messenger software module is further configured to access said calendar application software module via a uniform resource locator (URL). McDowell discloses all the limitations as disclosed above except for accessing said calendar application via a uniform resource locator (URL).

Coan teaches the ability to access calendar information through a URL. The general concept of providing the ability to access a calendar application through a URL is well known in the art as illustrated by Coan which discloses a URL access in a calendar application.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDowell of his calendar application in his advantageous method as taught by Coan in order to provide for the ability for “searching the calendar, getting information from the calendar, or putting information in the calendar” as stated by Coan in column 6, liners 11-14.

Response to Argument(s)

Applicant's argument(s) filed on September 12, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection is maintained.

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues in substance that:
Cited reference taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest all limitations in the context of claim 1.
- In response to argument(s):
Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. As for the limitation "a calendar application storing schedule information...", McDowell discloses a system that provides an automatic pre-defined status indicators such as busy, not available, meeting and emergency only. Furthermore, system operator may add additional pre-defined status indicators if desired. In addition, the system makes it possible to synchronize calendar programs such as PIM (paragraph [0129], [0135]). As for the limitation "determining, for said particular time, whether a current presence state, which is associated with said given user...", Knauerhase discloses a calendar may include times, dates, and descriptions of meetings, teleconferences, appointments, and other events, tasks, annotations, and/or notes of interest to the user of mobile device in which the user may input entries into the calendar. In addition, the mobile device may download entries into the calendar from another electronic device (paragraph [0038], [0062], [0063]). As for the limitation "in response to determining that a current presence state specific to the instant messenger client does not correspond to said activity status", Doss discloses updates to the user's calendar data preferably comprise changing the user's scheduled working hours and calendar events. If any updates occur, the calendar reflects the updates by changing the status of the user. An alternative or additional way in which a user's working hours or calendar events may be updated is in response to input from a status-aware application, as illustrated in FIG. 2. This example represents the display 200 of an IM client, where members of the user's work group are identified at 210 and graphical symbols and colors are used to indicate the IM status of each user, which

leverages the status change information in a novel way to automatically keep the user's calendar and working hours up-to-date, as appropriate (Fig. 2, paragraph [0032], [0059]). Therefore, the cited reference in combination meet the scope of the claimed limitation as currently presented. In an effort to expedite the disposition of this case, Applicant is invited to contact the Examiner to discuss possible amendment to the claimed language to better define the scope of the claimed subject matter and possibly overcome prior art in record.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Wasel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2454

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mohamed Wasel/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454
June 20, 2009

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454